

Appl. No. 10/816,426
Amendment dated July 29, 2005
Reply to Office Action of Feb. 1, 2005

Amendments to the Drawings:

A request for the Official Draftsman to accept changes to Fig. 1 accompanies this response. This sheet replaces the original sheet including Fig. 1.

Appl. No. 10/816,426
Amendment dated July 29, 2005
Reply to Office Action of Feb. 1, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4, 8, 11, 15, and 16 are pending in the application, with claims 2, 3, 5-7, 9-10, and 12-14 having been canceled, claims 1,4, 8, and 11 having been amended, and new claims 15 and 16 added.

The drawings have been objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). According to the Examiner: "The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, 'a sensor' must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s)."

The only claim in which the term "sensor" appeared was claim 3, which has now been canceled.

Figure 1 has been amended to change "28" to "28b" and to include "34b", both of which are described in the specification. A separate paper is submitted herewith showing the proposed changes in red for approval by the Examiner. Upon approval by the Examiner, new drawing(s) in compliance with §1.84 will be filed.

Claims 1-5, 8-9, and 12-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Byrt, (U.S. Patent No. 3,752,412). Claims 2, 3, 5, 9, and 12-14 have been canceled.

The Examiner has stated that claims 6-7 and 10-11 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Appl. No. 10/816,426
Amendment dated July 29, 2005
Reply to Office Action of Feb. 1, 2005

Claim 6 was dependent upon claim 5, which was dependent upon claim 2, which was dependent upon claim 1. Claim 1 has now been amended to include the features of former claims 2, 5, and 6, which have been canceled. It is submitted that this is equivalent to rewriting claim 6 in independent form.

Claim 7 was dependent upon claim 5, which was dependent upon claim 2, which was dependent upon claim 1. New claim 15 incorporates the features of claims 1, 2, 5, and 7. In effect, new claim 15 is former claim 7 rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 10 was dependent upon claim 9, which was dependent upon independent claim 8. Claim 8 has now been amended to include the features of former claims 9 and 10, which have been canceled. It is submitted that this is equivalent to rewriting claim 10 in independent form.

Claim 4 is dependent upon amended claim 1; claim 11 is dependent upon amended claim 8; and new claim 16 is dependent upon new claim 15.

Accordingly, it is requested that the rejection of claims 1-5, 8-9, and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Byrt be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 10/816,426
Amendment dated July 29, 2005
Reply to Office Action of Feb. 1, 2005

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance and an early Office Action to that end is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

27 July 2005
Date

for [Signature] Reg. No. 30,754
James L. Lewis
Reg. No. 24,732

Levy & Grandinetti
Suite 408
1725 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006-1419

(202) 429-4560